

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

“Darden says Fuhrman is lying; Vannatter and Lange say the same thing. Now who is more honorable, Lange and Darden, or Fuhrman? Who would you rather meet in a dark alley?” — Christine Armas, social activist, OJI

In the midst of the excitement about Fuhrman's polygraph, Phil Rabne made the mistake of pointing out the difference between fighting and battering in a spousal relationship. He really got into trouble when he suggested that Nicole might have borne some responsibility for the 1989 incident that put the knot on her forehead and got O.J. arrested for battering. That was too much for “nice guy” Judge, who jumped all over him just as he jumped all over me without taking the time to understand what he was objecting to. Yeah, the judge was at it again. This time, Phil was the subject of his half-baked observations and full-fledged scorn. In addition to being attacked by other OJG's for the questions he asked about Fuhrman's Polygraph... OJU or OJI, he was getting the full OJI treatment....

Subj: Welcome to our world
Date: 97-03-20 17:48:13 EST
From: Hhhana
To: Rabne
CC: Pat, Trooper

Hey Phil—You can't ask questions about the tester, the questions, or the reliability of the test itself. You cannot question the blood, and certainly don't ever wonder in print if the relationship of the Simpsons might have been one in which they both participated in fighting.

I was surprised to see the message from Judge. He's sure a nice guy, must have pushed his buttons with the violence thing. I hope he will take the time to re-read the letters he finds so bad. There is a huge difference between battering and fighting.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Hope you catch the show on CNN. I'll be glued to the tube
—Paula

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: Thursday, March 20, 1997 5:02 PM
From: Tiger
To: Rabne
CC: All

Phil— You're getting a bit arrogant yourself. You want to judge the questions? The test was administered by the most widely acknowledged polygraph expert in the country, and corroborated by the head of the American Polygraph Association. What in your background qualifies you to determine the validity of the questions? The two most important questions asked if Fuhrman planted the glove at Rockingham, and if he actually saw the bloody print on the back gate. In fact only the first question is really important. If he did not plant the glove, the only person who could have left it there is good old OJ himself. Give it up. —Tiger

Subj: Re: Welcome to our world
Date: 97-03-20 19:45:00 EST
From: Phil (Philip T. Rabne)
To: Hhhana
CC: Rabne [*Editor's note: If you don't send a copy of your e-mail letter to yourself, you may lose it. That's how most of us lost most of our letters, that weren't copied by someone else, before we caught on*], Pat, Trooper

Paula— I suspect Tiger is used to managing people (as in a staff). Her technique reminds me of bosses I used to have. She tests to see what has effect.

I'm bad to "label people." Sometimes, it's hard as hell to peel a label off (of course I depend on just that fact). Not that I really feel "a particular way" about someone, its just easier to manage

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

that person, particularly if you know how they'll react to the process of being labeled (not so much the label itself).

In all cases I go after behavior and not the person. That way the object of my "affection" remains relatively unscathed unless they strongly identify with their own behavior. In those cases I back off quick. No victory is worth making people feel bad about themselves. —Phil

Subj: Re: Fuhrman's test
Date: 97-03-20 18:29:07 EST
From: Cougar
To: Tiger
CC: All

Tiger— It is my understanding from what I heard last night that the questions were asked just as Flea phrased them to Fuhrman originally. —Cougar

Subj: Re: Fuhrman and Vannatter
Date: 97-03-20 19:32:25 EST
From: Dable
To: Tiger, Rabne, Bull
CC: All

Tiger— I only heard the questions 'did you see the blood on the Bronco door' and 'did you see the blood on the bottom of the door' (paraphrase) and I think a direct question of 'did you plant the Rockingham glove'. Did I miss the question on the gate? He was not asked if he *planted* the blood on the Bronco. And yes I, too, want to know what questions were asked....all of them. For if the questions were not phrased to elicit answers that will settle some of these doubts, they were ineffectual. —Dianne (Dable)

Subj: Re: The Biased Media
Date: 97-03-20 19:54:53 EST
From: Chameleon

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

To: Bull M

CC: All

Bull—I searched 56 sites that I have, and found not one word...even ABC Prime Time Live...it wasn't their Spotlight for last night...a piece that John C. did was their Spotlight...haven't found the transcript. Even did an extensive search of Court TV...It is probably hidden away on someone's webpage. —Chameleon

Subj: Re: The Biased Media

Date: Thursday, March 20, 1997 3:00 PM

From: Cougar

To: Chameleon

CC: All

Chameleon—I tried too with no more success than you had.
—Cougar

Subj: Re: The Biased Media

Date: 97-03-20 22:30:56 EST

From: Tiger

To: Cougar, Chameleon

CC: All

Cougar, Chameleon— Could it be that we're the only ones left alive on the planet who really care? —Tiger

Subj: Re: The Biased Media

Date: 97-03-20 22:40:19 EST

From: Trille (Christine Armas)

To: Trooper, Puma, Dable, Connie (Connie), Hhhana, Pat, Cougar

CC: All

Hi guys— Wasn't F. Lee Bailey SUPERB, he really demolished that gas-bag polygraph "expert."

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

The publisher that paid for the test is a extreme right-wing John Birch Society publishing firm who called Eisenhower “pinko.” And they publish all the kooks like that other FBI agent who wrote about being in the White House, Aldrick, who wrote that the Clintons had SEX TOYS ON THE WHITE HOUSE CHRISTMAS TREE!

I would not brag about ever having worked for the FBI or the CIA! Also if polygraph tests are so reliable, Woody Allan, Anita Hill, Casper Weinburger were supposedly tested, I don't believe this at all, but if it is true then ANITA HILL IS TRUTHFUL AND CLARENCE THOMAS SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT!

Also, it is obvious Fuhrman is a psychopath and they can lie with impunity because to them lies don't count. Also, he claimed that he definitely saw several BLOODSTAINS on the door sill of the Bronco. That was never proven to be blood at all, let alone human blood or OJ's blood, so there is a demonstrable lie that slipped out. I don't suppose many people caught it. Also, it is very unlikely that with the amount of police, technicians, prosecutors, etc. etc, that were at the two crime scenes, that no one else would have seen the stuff that Fuhrman claims, except his partner. Obviously, they are both getting a lot of money off the book.

And that Brad Roberts, although he was listed as a witness was never called. So why is that? Is it because he didn't know anything? The photos of the so-called Swiss Army knives were too blurry to prove anything, and the clothes in the washer were Arnelle's underwear, and THIS CAME OUT IN A SIDE BAR AT THE CRIMINAL TRIAL. Judge Ito made a joke out of it, but these sleazoids can say anything on these shows, they are not under oath, they all disagree amongst themselves. Darden says Fuhrman is lying; Vannatter and Lange say the same thing. Now who is more

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

honorable, Lange and Darden or Fuhrman? Who would you rather meet in a dark alley? —Trille

Subj: Re: Larry King Live

Date: 97-03-20 22:45:31 EST

From: Margaret Richardson

To: All

All— Just got through watching Larry King Live. Anyhow, here goes, and I know the stuff is going to hit the fan. I agree with F. Lee Bailey that the one question he remarked about looked as though Mark Fuhrman lied. The blood pressure went bang! Of course, when the question was asked again, everything was cool. Now, what pisses me off is that I know the question was something about the evidence, but I can't remember if it was specific, or general, ie. a specific piece of evidence, or just "any" evidence.

Also, F. Lee Bailey looked like the F. Lee Bailey whose career I have followed, whose books I have read, and who, at one time, I thought was the greatest cross-examiner to come along. The man can be fierce. The examiner hedged too much for me. First he didn't want this to become a circus, then he had to get permission from the publisher (who paid for the test) and from Fuhrman.

What is so bad about submitting the test to a panel of his peers? If he is so very sure, what could they have to say, but agree with him. Also, this was the very first time I had ever heard anything about Bob Shapiro destroying the test OJ took. I can understand stopping the test. I'm sure OJ wasn't in any shape to take a lie detector test. I know that if my husband had been brutally murdered, and someone wanted me to take a lie detector test, I wouldn't be in any shape to take one. In fact, I probably wouldn't even understand the questions. But, for better or for worse (and I have a feeling it's going to get worse) those are my thoughts. —Peggy

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

If Paul Minor had chosen to lie about the entire test or any part of it, he could have. If he gave unconscious body language cues that the big questions were coming, he wouldn't have known. Minor and Fuhrman were the only witnesses to what happened. There were no audio or videotapes made, no independent members of the press invited, and no independent polygraph expert present in any capacity. In the end, the test results were a matter of trust in Paul Minor, a man who would not submit his findings to a peer review—unless given permission to do so by Regnery Publishing and Mark Fuhrman.

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-20 22:45:31 EST
From: Bear
To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
CC: All

Peggy— It was explained on the show that the blood pressure rose in anticipation of the question, in other words, before the question was actually asked, was it not? Of course Bailey is going to make a big deal about that one, we didn't expect anything different from him. —Bear

Subj: Larry King Live
From: Tiger
To: Peggy
CC: All

Peggy—The only thing I am grateful for is that Bailey represents YOUR side. If he were speaking for the OJG's, I'd convert to your side in seconds. What a load of crap. Bang? Are you serious? C'mon—your reaction was mapped out by us last night. We knew exactly what you would say. The same tactic as in the trial was used here—if you attack the test, attack the tester. Wait and see—There will be many other experts who will corroborate the validity of this test [Editor's Note: That never happened]. Then you will tell us they are only saying that because they all hate black people. No matter. The idol will never fall. —Tiger

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Subj: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-20 22:40:18 EST
From: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
To: Tiger
CC: All

Tiger— Your reaction came as no surprise at all. But your remark about black people did. That’s hitting below the belt, even for you Tiger, and I don’t appreciate it. —Peggy

Subj: Larry King Live
From: Bull R
To: Peggy
CC: All

Peggy—So now you are a polygraph “expert” just like the has-been Bailey. Tiger had it right and we all expected this scenario. Bailey showed what kind of great guy he is by his recount on the OJ polygraph and Shapiro hiding the charts. Does that tell you anything about the ethics of these people? This is truly a strange phenomenon that no matter what factual evidence is presented, there will always be someone who takes the opposite view that is supported by facts and denies the obvious. It is, and unbelievably continues, to be so laughable. —Bull R

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-20 22:55:09 EST
From: Lion
To: Peggy (Margaret Richardson)
CC: All

Peggy, what did you expect Bailey to say? I’m sorry! You are agreeing with Bailey and you don’t even remember if there was a “direct” question as to planting! Bailey represented Simpson; did you expect him to change hats now? Bailey could not KNOW unless he was God if Fuhrman planted geraniums, never mind the glove. He took a chance, and don’t

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

kid yourself, he was all ready with his Plan B if Fuhrman passed.

When have you ever seen experts agree unanimously on anything? Of course if they allowed 6 other experts to examine the test and give their opinions or interpretations the results would vary. We show that over & over again in the two trials...Photo experts disagreed, DNA experts disagreed, forensic scientists disagreed, and they ALL examined the same test results. So why should a distinguished, highly regarded expert like Paul Miner let Bailey railroad him into doing something that will be for naught? Bottom line, Mark Fuhrman passed the polygraph test, O.J. Simpson flunked badly...End of story... —Lion

How does one begin to cope with logic like that? The polygraph test is valid because expert A says so and, expert B agreed although experts C and D disagree. Since experts in general disagree on the same evidence, a panel of experts would not be able to agree; not 12 out of 12, or 9 out of 10 or 6 out of 8. But 2 out of hundreds or thousands means that you can rely on the conclusion reached by the 2... What kind of twisted mind wouldn't go for that deal?

Subj: Fuhrman's test

Date: 97-03-21 00:21:55 EST

From: Pat

To: Hhhana

CC: Trooper, Jaguar, Peggy, Dable

Well did you all see Fuhrman and Bailey on Larry King? What do you think? I think the ex-FBI guy was paid by Fuhrman's publisher to make sure he passed. He refused to send the test to the American Polygraph Board or whatever it is. He sure did a lot of stammering. I don't know about you, but I believe Bailey. Why would the examiner not send the result to the Board? He said it wasn't his to send, he'd have to get an OK from Fuhrman and the publisher of Fuhrman's book, but he had just shown it to the whole world on TV.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

The OJG's are going to say we are just sticking up for OJ. Poor MF was telling the truth and we won't accept it. Oh well. We'll wait and see what happens. —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Lie detector

Date: Thursday, March 20, 1997 10:02 PM

From: Trooper

To: Hhhana

CC: Patricia Whetham, Peggy, Trille, Dianne, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted

Paula— Did you see that farce of a test? Is Minor another example of our crack FBI at work?

Good Grief! —Jasper

Subj: Re: Larry King Live

Date: Thursday, March 20, 1997 10:59 PM

From: Pat

To: Lion, Margaret Richardson

CC: All

Tiger—the direct question that had to be asked twice because his BP went up the first time was, “DID YOU PLANT THE GLOVE AT ROCKINGHAM?” —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Larry King Live

Date: Saturday, March 22, 1997 3:24 PM

From: Tiger

To: Patricia Whetham, Lion, Margaret Richardson

CC: All

Pat, the BP went up slightly, BEFORE the question was asked—therefore the repeat. The anticipation of a loaded question which has haunted you because of false accusations for 2 years would make anyone a bit nervous. Repeating a question on a polygraph for verification is standard operating procedure. —Tiger

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-22 15:36:16 EST
From: Pat
To: Lion, Peggy, Tiger
CC: All

Tiger—If you believe that I've got some swampland for sale cheap. —Pat

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: Saturday, March 22, 1997 5:39 PM
From: Bear
To: Patricia Whetham
CC: Lion, Peggy, Tiger, Chameleon, Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Bull M, Puma, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Panther, Bull R

Crowe— I will again send out the message I had sent to you earlier regarding question 15. Please read: Please read the following excerpt from the transcript of Larry King Live. I had answered Peggy regarding this particular question, that his reaction was noted 5 seconds prior to the asking of the question. My memory was correct. Perhaps this will put any questions regarding this particular question (15) to rest once and for all. —Bear

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-22 16:20:05 EST
From: Pat
To: Bear
CC: Lion, Peggy, Tiger, Chameleon, Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Bull M, Puma, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Panther, Bull R

Bear— Don't bother sending it again. I read it, I watched the show, I read the transcript, I have the show on tape I just don't believe it. I think Minor sold out to the publisher. I do not think the test was conducted properly. If it was, why

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

won't Minor send it out to his peers in the American Polygraph Association? Something stinks to high heaven. Bailey did not ask him to send it to one of his friends. He asked Minor to send it to the Association he belongs to and he refused. That makes me think something is wrong.

MINOR: The two questions that I think would be of great interest is question 15: Did you plant the bloody glove in Rockingham? And as you can see there is a rise of blood pressure there. However, if you look very closely, that rise starts about five seconds prior to the asking of the question, so that's really not relevant and there was some movement there possibly a little bit of discomfort from the cuff caused a little flexing the muscle.

MORET: What was the answer to that question?

MINOR: He answered "no" to that question—did you plant the bloody glove at Rockingham? "No." Now, seeing that there in close proximity in the rise of blood pressure, I asked that same question a second time. Right here is question 15-R. It just means question 15 repeated. And as you can see, there's no appreciable reaction there at all compared to the control question following immediately after that: Are you afraid you'll fail this polygraph test?

MORET: Why did you ask that question twice?

MINOR: I saw the rise of blood pressure immediately prior to the asking of the question, and just to make it a clean chart and to make sure that I wasn't overlooking something, I re-asked the question a second time. And I also ran these questions again on another chart in addition to this. But this is how it came out. There was just no reaction there.

And again, as I said, the biggest reaction is out here at the control question, and the way polygraph works is you compare the reaction here to the reaction here. And, of course, the control question is far and above that. The other ques-

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

tion that would be of interest, is number 16—right here. Did you plant any evidence in the Simpson case? Did you plant any evidence, meaning at either residence? And of course, at 16, there is no appreciable reaction there at all. — Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: Saturday, March 22, 1997 6:27 PM
From: Bear
To: Patricia Whetham
CC: All

Crowe— Bailey wanted the polygraph expert for the LAPD to do the test. Do you not think that “that stinks?” Something is definitely wrong when Bailey wants to involve any part of the LAPD in this... —Bear

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-22 16:54:42 EST
From: Pat
To: Bear
CC: All

Bear— ...As for Bailey wanting the LAPD guy to do the test, he said it was because he was familiar with LAPD and its officers. The something definitely wrong is Minor not wanting to send it to his own association for review. That smells to me of cover-up. —Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: 97-03-23 10:48:18 EST
From: Bear
To: Pat
CC: All

Crowe—Bailey challenged Fuhrman to take the test in early Feb (I believe) of this year! I would say that he took up the challenge very quickly, don't you? I think your last sentence says it all. It wouldn't matter if the APA did review the test

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

results...in your mind he had lots of time to “practice,” therefore whatever their conclusions were, would be incorrect in your eyes! Tell me why you then insist on the APA reviewing them? —Bear

Subj: Bailey’s request...

Date: 97-03-23 13:19:09 EST

From: Lion

To: Pat

CC: All

Pat (Crowe)— That’s a valid question Bear is asking. If you are of the opinion that “the results don’t matter” why are you supporting Bailey’s demands? —Lion

Subj: Re: Poster Boy

Date: Sunday, March 23, 1997 11:39 AM

From: Trooper

To: Patricia Whetham

CC: Hhhana, Peggy, Trille, Dianne, Chameleon, Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie, Jaguar

Pat—The fact that so many OJG’s have embraced Fuhrman with such pride and glee on the basis of the test (taken in private) that we all saw re-enacted on Larry King Live, ought to remind them of something. Remember how the OJG’s you knew reacted to Fuhrman’s first appearance on the witness stand?

I do.

I was at work where I was surrounded by them. They were hi-fiving each other and saying what a jerk Bailey was for bringing up all that nonsense about Fuhrman being a racist. They could see for themselves by Mark Fuhrman’s smooth, steady performance that the detective had been unfairly branded a racist for a few insensitive words he may have used over ten years before. Anyone who said otherwise was clearly injecting race where it didn’t belong—but you know how THOSE PEOPLE are. If Fuhrman said he hadn’t used the

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

“n” word in 10 years, he hadn’t. Anybody with half a brain could see that for themselves by comparing what he said and how he said it to everything else he said and how he said it. The man was a star!

That was their first test of Fuhrman’s credibility and their first “proof” that Bailey was the MF, not MF. Now it’s happening again. The multitude is again embracing Mark Fuhrman. Don’t be surprised to see him run for political office soon. And don’t be surprised to see him win. It’s at times like this that I wish I could hide my country from the world and say, “That wasn’t really us you saw, not deep down in our heart of hearts.” But if I did say that, what would happen to my credibility?

Your embarrassed American friend —Jasper

Subj: Re: Poster Boy

Date: 97-03-23 12:49:50 EST

From: Pat

To: Trooper

CC: Hhhana, Peggy, Trille, Dable, Chameleon , Kim, Connie, Rabne, Ted, Maggie, Jaguar

Jasper— Things like that don’t just happen in America I’m sorry to say. They happen here too. I watched a movie this morning about Little Rock Arkansas, in the late fifties when integration was ordered by Eisenhower. It is so upsetting to know that things like that happened so few years ago. I know the problems are still there and I know it was just a movie but what those kids had to go through to attend a white high school. It just makes my angry that we haven’t moved further away from this garbage. Oh well. I guess change takes time but sometimes it seems as if it’s crawling instead of flying.
—Pat (Crowe)

Subj: Brutality vs. frame-up

Date: 97-03-22 15:34:05 EST

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

From: Maggie

To: Bull

CC: Chameleon, Pat, Trooper, Lion, Bear, Rabne, Matlock, Tiger, Hhhana

Bull—Hi! My name is Maggie and I'd like to address something in your post. Police frame-up was used indirectly in the Rodney King case. Anyone who wanted the public to believe that it took that many police officers to "keep King down" on the ground was engaging in a frame up. That may not have been pled in the case but it was implicit to the defense of those police officers that people believed that Rodney King "deserved" the brutality that was shown in the video.

—Maggie

Maggie— Welcome, please post your messages at the top, it is easier to follow that way. Can you not see the difference between brutality, of which some police are surely guilty, as well as some civilians (noted case in point, OJ), and frame-up, not cover up but frame up. Sure you can tell me of many cases of police brutality, but I challenge you to tell me of one case, anywhere in the USA, that the defense was "frame-up" Can't you see the difference? —Bull M

Bull— I think frame-up and cover-up are interchangeable in the OJ case. When something is covered up (i.e., framed in a different way) then other things may be taken the wrong way. For instance, the glove on OJ's property—why did the police jump on that as proof that OJ was a suspect? (I always wondered why they related the glove to OJ before they ever met OJ to begin with. That's weird.)

In California, land of the "strange stalkers of stars" (Madonna had a guy jump a fence and enter her property, Teresa Saldana had a guy stalking her almost on her doorstep, Rebecca Shaeffer, etc.) why wouldn't the police's first gut reaction be "The killer came from Bundy to Rockingham," not "Oh now I know OJ is a suspect." (Remember Vannatter

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

claimed that he was used to dealing with celebs so theoretically he would relate the glove to other celeb stalking cases.)

Thus the frame-up begins when the police “rush to judgment” and declare that OJ is the guy who committed the crime, without an in-depth study of the relation of drug crimes, (Faye Resnick, with drugs, had lived at the Bundy address one week prior to the tragedy and Ron was carrying a white envelope about the size of a “drug stash.” We know it did not contain drugs but a crazy drug addict desperate for drugs might not have known it.) and celeb stalking (in view of those I earlier cited). I never understood why the police did not research this case from every angle especially since the world seemed to be watching right from the start.

—Maggie.

Maggie—You are making some big leaps in regard to the rush to judgment. After declaring Rockingham a crime scene based on the evidence that was found, Simpson became a suspect. They questioned him that day, but remember they did not arrest Simpson until the initial blood testing came back and linked Simpson. That evidence, along with others such as no alibi, the Bronco, etc. is when they issued a warrant. There was no rush to judgment, the evidence pointed only to Simpson. They did look for evidence to clear Simpson but found none. And they did check out other leads as they came in.

Also, as I stated in other posts, the defense did have Pavelic and other investigators looking into your areas of concern, such as Faye Resnick, and found nothing. They are the ones that came up with some of the bogus witnesses, such as Rosa Lopez and Gershias, and we know what happened with them. They were the ones to dig up dirt on Fuhrman etc. So don't think for a minute that the defense didn't try to find evidence to clear Simpson. They did, but came up empty.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

And now with Fuhrman passing a polygraph, I think it is time for some clear and logical thinking to begin on the part of the OJI's and the guilt of Simpson. However, I haven't seen any integrity in that regard. —Bull R

Apparently Bull R hadn't read Lange and Vannatter's book, "Evidence Dismissed: The Inside Story of the Police Investigation of O.J. Simpson." That's what it says, on the cover, ".Investigation of O.J. Simpson," and that's what the book is about. The only evidence they looked for or followed up on was that which they thought would help to convict O.J. Simpson of murder. They couldn't understand, for instance, why Marcia Clark refused to call a credible witness who could testify to seeing O.J. throw something in a trash can at the airport. O.J.'s PI's knew why. It was because O.J. was on camera at LAX from the time he got out of his limo to the time he got on the plane, and all of the trash cans had been searched. In other words, the LAPD detectives acted just like our OJG's. Whatever pointed to innocence they ignored, misrepresented or forgot. Whatever pointed to guilt they accepted without question even if crucial elements were missing or they didn't quite add up.

Subj: Re: Frame-ups
Date: 97-03-22
From: Pat
To: Maggie
CC: All

Hi Maggie— Welcome. I like the way you think. Don't let the OJG's get you down. Bull must have read Vincent Bugliosi's book as what he says above about police frame-ups comes directly from there. I am definitely an OJI so welcome again and I look forward to hearing more from you. —Pat

Subj: Re: Frame-ups
Date: 97-03-22 16:54:49 EST
From: Maggie
To: Bull
CC: Peggy (Margaret Richardson), Matlock, Tiger, Cougar, Rabne, Pat, Chameleon, Puma, Lion, Bear, Hhhana, Trooper, Jaguar, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Panther

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

Bull— ...I should tell you that I do not nor did I read tabloids or watch “OJ is guilty” based talk shows. My comments come from the trials, as well as LKL show who allowed both sides to be represented.

My arguments are my arguments, not rehashing from the defense. I do not accept leaps made on the basis of speculation that the detectives didn't have the benefit of hindsight. They had something that should have been better — 90+ years of experience that says when you come upon a scene you investigate thoroughly instead of speculating with “on the spot screenplays” based on what someone remembers happening 9 years earlier at another location (MF 1985). A thorough investigation would have taken a few weeks and would have included a drug theory even if later it was disproved. (LA has a known drug scene). You do not look at a glove and say “OJ did it” unless you know that it is OJ's glove and you saw him wearing it earlier that night maybe!!! Since that didn't take place well... —Maggie

Maggie— ...Let's put this to rest. You are overlooking the totality of my post. The fact is that the defense had more investigators that just Pavelic and they turned over every rock to find anything on Resnick and her connections. You are making an incredible leap based on nothing more than speculation. The LAPD had the incredible job of following up on leads submitted to them from the public, no matter how ludicrous those claims were. It may not have been Lange and Vannatter, but it was other detectives. Whatever witnesses were not used by the prosecution could and in some cases were used by the defense. Listen, your argument on conspiracy to frame Simpson doesn't hold any water. It's the usual speculation. You are ignoring the evidence that pointed only to Simpson. This is an old bogus defense argument that doesn't get any better by rehashing it. —Bull R

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Maggie— Welcome. And thanks for the insightful input. But, be prepared. It appears you are an OJI or OJU, so get ready. I hope you have a good sense of humor and a nice strong back. Right at first the OJG's may be polite, but as we go along you will get dumped on, bad. I agree with you as far as why the police did not investigate further. It just reinforces Vannatter's lie about "OJ not being a suspect." In Bosco's book he refers to the fact that only hours after the murders were committed, Marcia Clark stated she "knew OJ was the killer, all the evidence was a trail leading right to OJ." I think the DA needed a high profile case, and needed to win a high profile case since he had done so badly on the Menendez brothers, and others. He was only re-elected by a narrow margin from what I understand, and that margin was probably some of the people who believe OJ was guilty, and voted for that reason to re-elect him. I think that's why this case just won't be laid to rest until these questions are answered, and although you will receive all sorts of rhetoric from the OJG's you probably won't get any direct answers to your questions. You will hear a lot about DNA, Bruno Magli shoeprints, blood-drops beside Bruno Magli shoeprints, and photos of O.J. in Bruno Magli shoes, but don't question the time frame, the "wet" glove at Rockingham, Mark Fuhrman's role in the case, Faye Resnick's involvement, any of the testimony in either case, or any police misconduct. It just didn't happen. —Peggy

Subj: OJ Simpson

Date: 97-03-22 20:31:09 EST

From: Jaguar

To: Tiger, Lion, Pat

CC: Bear, Peggy, Chameleon, Matlock, Cougar, Rabne, Puma, Hhhana, Trooper173, Judge, Dable, Diana, Connie, Ted, Wildcat, Panther, Bull M

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

Lion, Tiger, Pat— I'm convinced. Those who believe he's innocent will believe that until the day they die. Those that think he's guilty will never change their minds...

Until the day we pass on into the great unknown, people will be debating this case with unflagging conviction on both sides. Just think, for the rest of our natural lives, people will be asking...

“Do you think OJ Simpson was framed?”

He is locked into our inner consciousness now, an archetypal symbol of the Fallen Hero, giving rise to a new eternal antithesis more universally compelling than Truth and Beauty because there is no unity: Are you OJG or OJI? And attached to these designators are all the social differentiators that no civil person would overtly broach: race, education, and intelligence—“You think he's innocent? What are you, black or stupid?” Instead, we wage our battle between the polarities of totality and plethora, assembling and disassembling, pitting logic against intuition, science against mysticism, objectivity against pure belief as the evidence is hashed and re-hashed without refrain.

And so we march forward, harbingers of the new millennium, divided more deeply than religion about the blood on the socks and the pictures of the Bruno Magli shoes... no hope of reconciliation here, just the endless cycling of arguments that will slowly evolve, shift and simplify over time until all that is needed to set us apart is: are you OJI or OJG? 'Nuf said.

There are larger, more important themes here, but they get lost in all the muck. I mean, really, what do these differences—OJI v. OJG—say about us, as people, as a society? The trials themselves are like suns that will never set, but there's something to be found in both the light that is cast and the shadows—why don't we look? There are plenty of

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

things to learn from all of this, about ourselves and each other, that we would have never known before... and that is worth thinking about. —Jaguar

Subj: OJ's living space

Date: 97-03-23 01:18:57 EST

From: Peggy

To: Tiger

CC: All

Tiger— ...It seems that anybody who saw something was subject to prosecution or run out of the country. Great police work. Why is it so hard to admit that just hours after the murder Marcia Clark stated "OJ did it, he's a wife beater, he's guilty,"? Vannatter lied when he said OJ was not a suspect when they went to Rockingham. And why was it necessary that four, count them, four detectives, two who were in charge of the crime scene at Bundy and two who had been there previously, had to go to OJ's? I mean is it the policy of the LAPD to just leave the crime scene and go to a man's house to tell him his ex-wife had been killed? Why didn't these four detectives go to the Brown home to tell them their daughter had been killed? At the time they went to OJ's did they even know who Ron was? In their eyes this was OJ from the get-go, and I think you all know that. —Peggy

Patricia Whetham wrote:

Why did it take Fuhrman 2 years to take the test? Why just when his book is out does he finally take it? How many other practice tests did he take? Too many unanswered questions to take the results seriously. Pat (Crowe)

Pat— More unanswered questions: Why didn't Simpson take the stand in the criminal trial, was he afraid of something? Why did Simpson flunk the prelim polygraph? Since the defense had already done a prelim, why didn't they continue and go on? Was it because Simpson did so badly, they knew

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

to continue would be disastrous for Simpson? Why did Simpson deny taking a polygraph at all? Was it because he scored a minus 22, one of the worst scores that could possibly be obtained? Far beyond someone who is anxious or nervous! Why did Fuhrman pass with flying colors and Simpson fail miserably? Pat, I am convinced you are in denial, and I don't mean the river in Egypt! —Lion

Pat—It seems to me that the fact that Fuhrman was willing to undergo the test indicates that he is willing to put his “money where his mouth is.” When Simpson does the same thing, I believe the OJI'S will have something to point to. Of all the people who would want to convince the public of his innocence, it should be Simpson. Some of you may not like Fuhrman, but he had the courage to hang out there for all to see. Where is O.J? —Tiger

Dianne— I know next to nothing about polygraphs, so my thoughts are based on nothing more than logic. But, a control question that elicits a true answer can also be used as a measuring stick to determine when an answer is a lie, logically. If you ask a control question like, “Is your name Mark Fuhrman?” or, “Are you in Washington DC right now,” the answer “yes” would indicate he was telling the truth and be reflected as such on the polygraph. That would then be the reference point to determine when the polygraph is indicating deception...Basically, it is what you were saying in reverse! Seems to me the control questions can be asked either way, to elicit a lie, a bit harder, or to elicit a true answer which then can be compared to the rest of the questions asked —Lion

Subj: Re: Larry King Live

Date: Friday, March 21, 1997 11:58 AM

From: Philip T. Rabne

To: Lion

CC: All

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD

Lion— It's also nice to have a response to an obvious lie so as to have a baseline for comparison to other possible lies. I'm bothered by the steady increase in BP throughout the session. I wish I knew what it meant. Care to hazard a guess?
—Phil

Phil—Probably that he was lying his damned fool head off. I don't know how anyone can believe anything he says. Now he's become the poster boy for the OJG's. It's disgusting. Funny how their memories can change. He was a real dog during the trial and now he's the cop of the century. Well my problem is—either Fuhrman or Vannatter and Lange are lying. Which one or ones? —Pat (Crowe)

Phil— I'll try to answer your question regarding the rise in BP using simple logic, since I am neither a doctor or an expert on polygraph testing...I can only imagine the stress factor of being accused of something so evil after 20 years as a law enforcement officer and living with that accusation for 2 ½ years. Why wouldn't his BP rise in anticipation of the "tell all" question he knew was coming? I would be more concerned if there was no change at all! That would certainly indicate total control, perhaps indicative of someone who was well rehearsed. So you see, I view the rise in BP as a normal occurrence to a question that is extremely disturbing, rather than to see it as an indication of a lie. —Lion

Subj: Re: Larry King Live
Date: Friday, March 21, 1997 11:52 PM
From: Matlock
To: Rabne, Lion
CC: All

Phil— Re rising blood pressure: "Because of the pressure on the upper arm's artery caused by the blood pressure cuff, tests are limited to no more than seven minutes." F. Lee Bailey, *The Defense Never Rests*, page 23. —Matlock

Chapter 25: A MINOR DISAGREEMENT

Subj: Re: Who's lying?

Date: 97-03-23 10:40:44 EST

From: Lion

To: Pat

CC: All

Pat (Crowe)— Polygraph test says Fuhrman is telling the truth! Polygraph test says Simpson is a liar, which also makes him a murderer! A double murderer! Court TV recorded THIRTY inconsistencies after a little more than ONE day's testimony by Simpson! Vannatter is just a man looking to retire with his wife, Rita, to a farm...

There is only one person with the best reason in the world to lie and that's the murderer, Simpson...and if I had to choose between Simpson and Fuhrman as a poster boy, I am afraid it would have to be Fuhrman! Are you familiar with the Eric Harris case that Fuhrman was involved in? Eric Harris was an African-American who was charged with murdering a white man in LA... Fuhrman was the cop who fought tooth and nail to prove he was innocent, and finally got the charges dropped!! Do some research, I'm sure you will find documentation of this... —Lion

The name is Aarick Harris. Fuhrman's efforts on his behalf followed his testimony in O.J.'s preliminary trial. Similar instances of Fuhrman behaving in a conspicuously non-racist way don't go back much farther than that. The interesting thing to me is that the murder case was never solved. In another case that Mark Fuhrman and Brad Roberts investigated, a black man was murdered and Fuhrman comforted the dead man's daughter—very publicly—the killer was never brought to justice, either. Put yourself in his shoes (size 12 Bruno Maglis). You have committed murder, perjury, witness tampering, and evidence tampering. You have a ton of racist baggage that you know will be used against you in court. You are, in short, vulnerable on many fronts, despite your cultivation of minority supporters in advance of the murders at 875 S. Bundy. Can the Aarick Harris case help you? Ask Lion, she'll tell you all you need to know.

IAGO IN BRENTWOOD